(Amended)

2. The method of claim 1 wherein the operating service retains [a] <u>an</u> operating service's reference to the application component and the step of destroying the state comprises releasing the <u>operating service's</u> reference to the application component by the operating service <u>while the client retains a client's reference to the application component</u>.

(Amended)

3. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of destroying the state comprises resetting the state of the application component <u>to the application component's initial post-creation state</u>.

(Amended)

4. The method of claim 1 [further comprising: performing the step of] <u>wherein said</u> destroying the state <u>is performed by the operating service</u> upon a next return of the application component from the client's call following the indication from the application component that the work is complete.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Prior Art Status Of Limprecht

Claims 5-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over art described in the "Background And Summary Of The Invention" section of the specification (hereafter "Background-described art") in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent 5,301,280 (hereafter "Schwartz"), and further in view of Limprecht, Microsoft Transaction Server, Compcon '97 Proceedings, IEEE (hereafter "Limprecht"). Applicants respectfully submit that Limprecht does not qualify as prior art to the present application, obviating the rejection.

The Limprecht paper fails to qualify as prior art because it is authored by one of the inventors and was published less than one year prior to the filing date. As discussed in MPEP § 706.02a, the paper does not qualify under 35 U.S.C. §